REMARKS

Claims 1, 7-18 and 20-30 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 18, 24, 25 and 27-29 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-10 of the Reply. Claims 15, 17 and 20-23 have been canceled.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of December 4, 2006.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 15 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 15 and 17 have been canceled, as such this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 15, 17 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention does not fall within at least one of the four categories of patent eligible subject matter. Claim 24 is rejected as not producing a useful, concrete and tangible result.

As stated *supra*, claims 15 and 17 have been canceled, as such the rejection is moot and should be withdrawn. Claim 24 has been amended to correct any deficiencies related to this reject. Accordingly, the rejection should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 24.

III. Rejection of Claims 15, 17, 18, 20-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 15, 17, 18, 20-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Schofield (US 6253252 B1). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Schofield does not anticipate each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every

> limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the … claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed subject matter relates to systems and methods for making asynchronous calls using a common pattern. More particularly, independent claim 18 (and similarly independent claims 24, 25, 27, 28 and 29) recites a method for converting code for a synchronous method call on a target method to code for an asynchronous method call, the method comprising: *receiving a code for a synchronous method call; passing the code for the synchronous method call through a call conversion process…; creating an asynchronous call result object to store results associated with the asynchronous method call; creating an asynchronous call state object to store state information associated with the asynchronous method call; …;* ***where code for synchronous method calls is associated with at least one of file input/output, stream input/output, socket input/output, networking, remoting channels, proxies, web forms, web services and messaging message queues can be converted; and where the asynchronous call result object comprises: a first field that holds information concerning whether the begin asynchronous operation completed asynchronously; and a second field that holds information concerning whether a server completed processing the target method***. Schofield does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in the subject claims.

Schofield discloses a method and apparatus for performing asynchronous object calls. The method involves invoking an operation on an object by calling a stub function from a client application. The client application provides the stub function with the input parameters to the operation along with a pointer to a completion routine. The invocation is sent to a server application using an execution environment common to the client and server application. The server application implements the operation on the object and provides a response to the execution environment. Once the operation has been

implemented by the server application, the execution environment calls the completion routine with the operation's output parameters. The completion routine should also determine whether or not the object call was successful. (*See* Col. 3, lines 45-64).

In contrast, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a system for making asynchronous calls using a common pattern, wherein a target method comprises passed parameters that can include, but are not limited to, input parameters, input/output parameters, output parameters and by reference parameters. Thus, a begin asynchronous operation method generated by the pattern generator accepts inputs including input parameters presented to the target method, input/output parameters presented to the target method and parameters passed by reference to the target method. Furthermore, to facilitate invoking processing associated with ending the asynchronous call, the begin asynchronous operation method also accepts the address of an asynchronous callback routine that can be invoked when the target method completes. To facilitate tracking and logging state associated with the asynchronous call and the target method, the begin asynchronous operation method also accepts an asynchronous call state object as an input.

Furthermore, an end asynchronous operation method generated by the pattern generator can similarly accept inputs including input/output parameters presented to the target method, output parameters presented to the target method, parameters passed by reference to the target method and the asynchronous call result object. The end asynchronous operation method will then return a type consistent with the return type of the target method. An asynchronous call result object generated by the pattern generator may have fields including, but not limited to a first field for recording whether the begin asynchronous operation completed asynchronously and a second field for recording whether a server completed processing the target method. (*See* pg. 7, line 29-pg. 8, line 26).

Schofield merely discloses the use of invoking an operation on an object by calling a stub function from a client application. Schofield does not disclose a method for converting code for a synchronous method call on a target method to code for an asynchronous method call. Accordingly, Schofield is silent with regard to a method for converting code ...; ***where code for synchronous method calls is associated with at least***

one of file input/output, stream input/output, socket input/output, networking, remoting channels, proxies, web forms, web services and messaging message queues can be converted; and where the asynchronous call result object comprises: a first field that holds information concerning whether the begin asynchronous operation completed asynchronously; and a second field that holds information concerning whether a server completed processing the target method.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Schofield fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in independent claims 18, 24, 25, 27, 28 and 29 (and claims 20-23 26 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP249US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731